



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/076,181	02/12/2002	Hal Hildebrand	2222.5390002	8962
26111	7590	10/10/2008		
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.			EXAMINER	
1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.			BATES, KEVIN T	
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2456	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/10/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/076,181	Applicant(s) HILDEBRAND ET AL.
	Examiner Kevin Bates	Art Unit 2456

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 October 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 10-27 and 29-35 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 10-27 and 29-35 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/95/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

Response to Amendment

This Office Action is in response to a communication made on October 1, 2008.

Claims 10, 18, and 21 are currently amended.

Claims 1—27, and 29-35 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10-27 and 29-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Misra (5757920) in view of Sitaraman (6212561).

Regarding claims 10, 18 and 21, Misra teaches a method for providing access management comprising:

(a) authenticating access privileges of a user to a first (Column 7, lines 53 – 65) and a second server machine (Column 5, lines 10 – 21) whereby the first and second server machine are configured to comprise a secured item (Column 5, lines 10 - 14); and

Misra does not explicitly indicate preventing access to a first one of the first and the second server machine while the user is accessing a second one of the first and second server machine; wherein the user is disconnected from the first one of the first

and the second server machine before being connected to the second one of the first and the second server machine.

Sitaraman teaches a system including a plurality of secure domains (Col. 6, lines 18 – 21) where the system forces the user to disconnect a first connection to a domain, before initiating a session connection to a secure domain (Col. 7, lines 8-23).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Sitaraman's teaching of only allowing the use to have one open session to a secure item or domain in Misra's system to ensure extra security against unauthorized users (Col. 9, lines 39 - 47).

Regarding claims 29, 31, and 34, Misra teaches the method as recited in claims 10, 18, and 21, wherein step (a) comprises:

(a1) authenticating the user with the first server machine with respect to a previous access request (Column 7, lines 53 – 65);

(a2) subsequently receiving a current access request via the second server machine (Column 5, lines 10 – 21); and

(a3) authenticating the user with the second server machine with respect to the current access request (Column 5, lines 10 – 21, where the user roams into a second domain, which can include using a different computer in the second domain, see Col. 7, lines 23-30).

Regarding claims 30, 32, and 35, Misra teaches the method as recited in claims 29, 31, and 34.

Misra does not explicitly indicate that wherein step (b) comprises:

(b1) upon receiving the current access request via the second server machine, identifying a first local module previously supporting the user at the first server machine;

(b2) reconfiguring the first local module at the first server machine to remove support for the user at the first server machine;

(b3) identifying a second local module to support the user at the second server machine; and

(b4) reconfiguring the second local module at the second server machine to add support for the user at the second server machine.

Sitaraman teaches a system including a plurality of secure domains (Col. 6, lines 18 – 21) where the system forces the user to disconnect a first connection to a domain, before initiating a session connection to a secure domain (Col. 7, lines 8-23).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Sitaraman's teaching of only allowing the use to have one open session to a secure item or domain in Misra's system to ensure extra security against unauthorized users (Col. 9, lines 39 - 47).

Regarding claims 11, 22, and 25, Misra teaches a method as recited in claims 29, 31, and 21, wherein step (a1) authenticates both the user and a client machine being used by the user (Column 4, line 66 – Column 5, line 9).

Regarding claims 12 and 26, Misra teaches a method as recited in claims 29 and 21, wherein the first and the second server machine are access points for the user to gain access to the secured item (Column 5, lines 10 – 14).

Regarding claims 13 and 23, Misra teaches a method as recited in claims 29 and 32, wherein when the user is at a first location, the user interacts over a network with the first server machine, and when the user is at a second location, the user interacts over a network with the second server machine using a second client machine at the second location (Column 5, lines 10 – 21).

Regarding claims 14, 20, and 27, Misra teaches a method as recited in claims 30, 32, and 35, wherein said method further comprises: determining, prior to steps (b1), (b2), (b3), and (b4), whether the user is permitted to gain access from a second location to the secured item via the second server machine (Column 5, lines 10 – 16).

Regarding claim 15, Misra teaches a method as recited in claim 39, wherein said step (a1) occurs while the user is at a first location, and wherein step (a2) occurs while the user is at a second location (Column 5, lines 10 – 21, wherein the system has a home location with maintains the credentials and authorization, which is then distributed through the server system).

Regarding claims 16 and 24, Misra teaches a method as recited in claims 17 and 33, wherein said method further comprises:

(a4) upon receiving the current access request to access the secured item via the second server machine, determining permitted locations from which the user is permitted to access to the secured item;

(a5) determining, whether the second location is one of the permitted locations for the user; and

(a6) bypassing steps (b1), (b2), (b3), and (b4) when step (a5) determines that the second location is not one of the permitted locations for the user (Column 5, lines 10 – 21).

Regarding claims 17, 19, and 33, Misra teaches a method as recited in claims 30, 31, and 32, wherein:

when the user is at the first location, the user interacts over a network with the first server machine using a first client machine at the first location, and

when the user is at the second location, the user interacts over a network with the second server machine using a second client machine at the second location (Column 3, line 67 – Column 4, line 7; Column 4, line 66 – Column 5, line 2; Column 5, lines 10 – 19, wherein the user and machine locations are roaming in the system and which ever domain the user/machine combination logs in at it connects to that domains controller which is the same location as the machine location).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed October 1, 1008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that Sitaraman does not indicate that the first and second machine are both in the same "system" and that the user is "caused" to disconnect. The applicant appears to be arguing elements that are not present in the claimed

invention. Claims 10, 18, and 21 only indicate that there are a first and second server machine, but does not go into detail whether they are located within the same "system." Nor does the claimed invention include the ability to "cause" the user to be disconnected. Accordingly the combination of Misra and Sitaraman reads on the claimed invention.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Bates whose telephone number is (571)272-3980. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchanwanit can be reached on (571) 272-3913. The fax

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kevin Bates/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2456